



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CA
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,942	07/21/2003	Marco Pappagallo	05986/100K504-US1	7691
7278	7590	08/06/2007		
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770			EXAMINER KIM, JENNIFER M	
			ART UNIT 1617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/624,942	Applicant(s) PAPPAGALLO, MARCO	
	Examiner Jennifer Kim	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/6/2007; 6/5/2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/5/2007 and 6/6/2007 has been entered.

Action Summary

The rejection of claims 1-3, 5- 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Geusens et al. (2001) is being maintained for the reasons stated in the previous Office Action.

The rejection of claims 1, 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urban et al. (2001) in view of Bader et al. is being maintained for the reasons stated in the previous Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 6, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that according to the Declaration of Dr. Marco Pappagallo, the patient described in Geusens has osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures and that the diagnosis of osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures is based on the patient's history of osteoporosis. The Declaration of Dr. Marco Pappagallo has been carefully considered and it is persuasive to the extent that the patient described in Geusens has osteoporotic vertebral compression. However, the instant claims do not exclude the patient population disclosed by Geusens. Applicant is reminded that the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 26, USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). See also *In re Morris*, 44, UPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement suit). In any case, the prior art does teach the treatment of extreme back pain as the result of multiple vertebral fractures with patient having osteoporosis with intermittent intravenous pamidronate (bisphosphonate). Therefore, given the broadest and reasonable interpretation of the instant claims, the cited prior clearly anticipated the claimed invention. Applicant argues that combination of Urban and Bader do not disclose or suggests treating chronic spinal mechanical pain, i.e., back pain lasting more than twelve weeks which is not caused by cancer or an osteoporotic fracture, and

Art Unit: 1617

that bone cancer pain is excluded from the definition of chronic spinal mechanical pain. Again, this is found unpersuasive because the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 26, USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). See also *In re Morris*, 44, UPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement suit). It is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ zoledronic acid for the treatment of pain in intravenous administration because zoledronic acid has significant anti-allodynic effects and it is well-known to be administered intravenously and preferably made available and utilized in parenteral infusion and injection formulation as taught by Bader et al. With respect to the limitation of treatment of back pain lasting more than twelve weeks, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ zoledronate for treatment of any condition of pain because zoledronate has significant anti-allodynic effect as taught by Urban. There is a reasonable expectation of successfully treating any pain condition including chronic spinal mechanical pain, because zoledronate possess significant anti-allodynic effect is well known in view of Urban et al. Thus, the claims fail to patentably distinguish over the state of the art as represented by the cited references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-3, 5- 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Geusens et al. (2001) of record.

Geusens et al. teach that an 18-year-old boy presented with extreme back pain as the result of multiple vertebral fractures was treated with intermittent intravenous bisphosphonate such as pamidronate. (abstract). Geusens et al. teach that intermittent IV infusions of pamidronate were given at dose of 30mg infusion, 300 mg in total over 9 month. (page 390 right-hand column first sentence originated from left-hand column, bottom). The boy progressively recovered from back pain and is now, at age 20, fully ambulant. (abstract).

The teaching from Geusens et al. that the boy suffered from vertebral fracture back pain encompasses Applicant's limitation of spinal mechanical pain because the term vertebral is referred to spinal column. With respect to the limitation of more than one dose is administered set forth in claim 2 is anticipated by the Geusens et al's teaching that the dose of pamidronate were given over total of 9 month. With respect to the limitation of single dose set forth in claim 11 is anticipated by the Geusens et al's teaching because a single dose of 30mg per infusion was given at a time.

Art Unit: 1617

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urban et al. (2001) in view of Bader et al, both of record.

Urban et al. teach that the bisphosphonate, zoledronate (30mcg/kg, s.c.) produced a significant anti-allodynic effect in rats. (abstract).

Urban et al. do not teach the intravenous administration of zoledronic acid for the treatment of pain.

Bader et al. report that bisphosphonates and their salts including zoledronate has been used as parenteral preparations for intravenous infusion and injection and preferably made available and utilized. (column 1, lines 14-26).

Art Unit: 1617

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ zoledronic acid for the treatment of pain in intravenous administration because zoledronic acids is well-known to be administered intravenously and preferably made available and utilized in parenteral infusion and injection formulations as taught by Bader et al. One would have been motivate do employ zoledronic acid in preferred parenteral preparations including intravenous injection in order to provide alternative parenteral preparations next to subcutaneous injectable taught by Urban. There would have been a reasonable expectation of successfully administering zoledronic acid intravenously for the treatment of pain because intravenous infusion and injection formulation of zoledronate are preferably made available to be utilized as reported by Bader et al.

For these reasons the claimed subject matter is deemed to fail to patentably distinguish over the state of the art as represented by the cited references. The claims are therefore properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103.

None of the claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-0628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 6:30 am to 3 pm.

Art Unit: 1617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jennifer Kim
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1617

Jmk
July 30, 2007